

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 2745	
10/585,409	07/07/2006	Yasunori Urano	034201.006		
441 SMITH, GAM	7590 08/16/201 BRELL & RUSSELL	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1130 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 1130 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			HAVAN, HUNG T		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2164	•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/16/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/585,409		URANO, YASUNORI	
Examiner		Art Unit	
HUNG HAVAN		2164	

	HUI	NG HAVAN	2164					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 01 August 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of th application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places that application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31: or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	of the	final rejection.						
Dimplementary or properties on (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHIS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: It box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See WHEP 706 207(0).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee and be been filled it be date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) at set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office latter than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS.	nsion	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since					
		ior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered because					
 \(\) The proposed amendment(s) flied after a final rejection, I. \((a) \) They raise new issues that would require further co. \((b) \) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloc). \((c) \) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or \((d) \) They present additional claims without canceling a 	nside w); ter fo	ration and/or search (see NOT	"E below); ducing or simplifying the issues for					
	corre	sponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). \[The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). \[\text{Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \[\text{Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling to the complex of								
no-allowable claim(s). No in-allowable claim(s) allowable claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) (sor will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR i.116(e). 								
2. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	n of t	he status of the claims after er	try is below or attached.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:								
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)								
/Kamini S Shah/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2128		/H. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 2164						

Continuation of 13. Other:

Applicant's argument is unpersuasive.

Applicant's amendment to claims change the scope of the claims and raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Specifically the claims now recite additional features of 'the outputs from the actual controller are used for the controller factors that are not subject to the evaluation, and the outputs from the virtual controller are used for the simulation as an engine control signal with respect to the controlled factors that are subjected to the evaluation."

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Therefore, Applicant's argument is unpersuasive.

To further compact prosecution, it is noted that support for amended claim feature is found at least on page 4, lines 11-15 and page 5, lines 3-15 of specification. It is also noted that claim 7 is drawn to a computer readable medium; however, the written description is silent regarding what is a computer readable medium.